8/16/69 Gary and Paul, it offucered to me, after I went to ded last night, that some of my letter to John may have been incomprehensible to you. Where Frazier prejured himself before the Commission. He said he had made a proper comparison, with a proper comparison microscrope, between a ~~bullet found~~ shell found at TSBD and two he fired himself in the M-Crifle. He hestified he took pictures of these shells' primers through the microscope. My attention was originally focused on this by what is not probable, his added testimony that he observed no other marks on that end of the shells, as was Dick's by the unexplained dents on these shells. Dick did some remarkable reasoning that, when we checked it our, turned out to be not necessarily valid and probably invalid. In the course of checking this further we did work and made observations that we would have made earlier, known in time for the N.O. trial, if my rifle had taken less than a year to get back from Calif., LA, where I loaned it to those stalwarts 2/68. We could duplicate the shell dents on the mouth with my rifle by really vigorous manipulation of the bolt, more vigorous, I think, than in usual operation (but I could be wrong here, for it could depend on the riflemen). One of the reasons I wanted to take our own photographer (which cost $50) was so we could make pictures the way we wanted. Had a hassle with Johnson, but we did it. He kept the figleaf on by having his photographer use the cable release to snap the picture, the only thing his man did. Then I wanted Dick to rotate the pix until he got each lined up exactly with the others and overlay negatives of the same size. Meanwhile, although he didn't tell me until later, when I told John, he had noted that the allegedle single pictures, taken through the comparison microscope consisted, in each case, of two attached negatives! In the course of studying the pictures we got, we learned that he had(F, that is) followed standard procedures with his test and comparison subjects. I was and remained convinced there had to be bolt markings all over the brass end of the shell. I find he testified to their existence in N.O., where he was subject to cross examination. When John followed this up when he was in the Archives fighting with them because, when he ordered similar existing pictures they gave him pictures of the <u>printed</u> exhibit (which has the screen in) and then had the proper ones made. he discovered they are or different magnifications, which
screen in) magnifications, which means they were not taken through the scope.